



D2

U.S. Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data does not
prevent clearly substantiated
invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: EAC-01-096-53526 Office: Vermont Service Center

Date: JUN 21 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

Petition: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

[Signature]

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the director and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a software sales and development business with one employee and an estimated gross annual income of \$1 million. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as a sales manager for a period of three years. The director determined the petitioner had not established that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

On appeal, counsel submits a brief.

8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(ii) defines the term "specialty occupation" as:

an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The director denied the petition because the petitioner had not established that a baccalaureate degree in a specialized area was required for the proffered position. On appeal, counsel submits additional information and states, in part, that the Department of Labor's (DOL) Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook) indicates that the position of sales manager qualifies as a specialty occupation. Counsel further states that the degree requirement is common to the industry and that the proposed duties which include researching market conditions are so complex as to require a baccalaureate degree.

Counsel's statement on appeal is not persuasive. The Service does not use a title, by itself, when determining whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation. The specific duties of the offered position combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations are factors that the Service considers. In the initial I-129 petition, the petitioner described the duties of the offered position as follows:

- * Develop profitable business strategy for the company.
- * Provide 100% customer satisfaction.
- * Review the business analytically and make recommendations accordingly.

- * Prepare the yearly budget and targets to be achieved, keeping in consideration, the goals and objectives of the company.
- * Update the company on a regular basis about the progress of the business.
- * Present the achievements against the targets to the company on a monthly basis.
- * Make sales calls to the clients, liaison with the user groups and other forums and organizations to promote the products and services offered by the company.
- * Ensure the availability of the product for the end user.
- * Provide leadership to the marketing team.
- * Hire, train, and place the staff.
- * Protect the interest of the company and its clients, concerning issues like confidentiality, security, inventions and discoveries.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
4. The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

The petitioner has not met any of the above requirements to classify the offered position as a specialty occupation.

First, the Service does not agree with counsel's argument that the proffered position would normally require a bachelor's degree in business administration or a related field. The proffered position appears to combine the duties of a sales manager with those of a marketing manager. A review of the DOL's Handbook, 2002-2003 edition, finds no requirement of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specialized area for employment in sales and marketing managerial jobs. A wide range of educational backgrounds are suitable, but many employers prefer those with experience in

related occupations plus a broad liberal arts background. In addition, certain personal qualities and participation in in-house training programs are often considered as important as a specific formal academic background. Thus, the petitioner has not shown that a bachelor's degree or its equivalent is required for the position being offered to the beneficiary.

Second, although the PhD degree held by another of the petitioner's employees is noted, the petitioner has not shown that it has, in the past, required the services of individuals with baccalaureate or higher degrees in a specialized area such as business administration, for the offered position. Third, the petitioner did not present any documentary evidence that businesses similar to the petitioner in their type of operations, number of employees, and amount of gross annual income, require the services of individuals in parallel positions. Finally, the petitioner did not demonstrate that the nature of the beneficiary's proposed duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

Counsel cites unpublished AAU decisions, which have no precedential effect in this proceeding. See 8 C.F.R. 103.3(c). It is noted that counsel has provided insufficient discussion explaining how such unpublished decisions are similar to the instant petition. It was held in Matter of Obaiqbena, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988) and Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez, 17 I&N Dec. (BIA 1980) that the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence.

The petitioner has failed to establish that any of the four factors enumerated above are present in this proceeding. Accordingly, it is concluded that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position is a specialty occupation within the meaning of the regulations.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.